

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Bellamy Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Bellamy Elementary School

9720 WILSKY BLVD, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michele Toscani

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Bellamy Elementary School

9720 WILSKY BLVD, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	92%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Bellamy Elementary builds Leaders with HEART (Honesty, Effort, Achievement, Respect, Teamwork).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bellamy Elementary will be among the top achieving schools in the district.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hessler, Jessica	Principal	Instructional Leadership, Data Analyzer and Instructional Outcomes, Management and Operations, and Human Resources/Capital.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/24/2020, Michele Toscani

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	64	89	88	84	88	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	506
Attendance below 90 percent	9	15	10	14	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	6	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	96	100	91	89	100	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	592	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	37	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	7	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	100	91	89	100	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	592
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	37	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	7	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	52%	57%	48%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	55%	58%	47%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	50%	53%	36%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	60%	54%	63%	49%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	57%	62%	43%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	46%	51%	28%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	46%	50%	53%	52%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	36%	52%	-16%	58%	-22%
	2018	46%	53%	-7%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	55%	-17%	58%	-20%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
	2018	42%	51%	-9%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	54%	7%	62%	-1%
	2018	51%	55%	-4%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	57%	1%	64%	-6%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	53%	54%	-1%	60%	-7%
	2018	58%	54%	4%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%
	2018	49%	52%	-3%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	12	36	48	28	55	54	13				
ELL	34	44	52	51	64	58	29				
ASN	86	83		93	83						
BLK	24	50		33	43						
HSP	40	47	49	59	68	57	42				
WHT	59	58		68	65		50				
FRL	41	49	53	57	67	54	42				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	22	55	55	35	61	59	25				
ELL	31	58	63	44	67	65	33				
ASN	81	83		100	100						
BLK	36	36		52	68		54				
HSP	43	54	56	54	69	53	48				
WHT	63	54		74	77		62				
FRL	46	54	54	58	68	54	52				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	25	31	19	26	34	17	28				
ELL	25	32	33	33	41	33	21				
ASN	79	75		89	67						
BLK	37	37		30	16						
HSP	43	45	37	48	45	32	47				
WHT	63	54		51	39		69				
FRL	42	45	35	46	41	29	45				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	439
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our reading proficiency was our lowest data component overall. Our writing scores (combined with reading proficiency) were lower and resulted in many students scoring lower in the area of reading proficiency. Even though our writing scores increased from the prior year they are still not performing at a proficient level. There was a lack of knowledge of progress monitoring through strategic questioning. We spent a large amount of time teaching foundational skills that should have been mastered in primary grades.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Our data component showing the largest from the prior year is Science. With a change in personnel, there was not the same of support given to teachers who needed coaching and support. The district did come out to support during the year, but we feel it may have been too late. There was also not a large, heavy focus on Science in younger grades prior to this year so our students may have not had the level of exposure needed. In addition, our fifth grade teachers are all departmentalized and often had a difficult time balancing dedicated time between math and science.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 3rd grade reading. There was a lack of knowledge of progress monitoring through strategic questioning. We spent a large amount of time teaching foundational skills that should have been mastered. There was a large number of ESE and ELL students in the grade level. Most students came to third grade comprehending 1-2 years behind expected performance.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our component that showed the most improvement was math proficiency. Our school heavily focused on standards based planning, targeting students in math through the RtI process rather than just focusing on reading. We focused on number talks and ensuring we focused on math facts and fluency. This past year, even though we do not have data, we have focused on giving monthly assessments, making plans to address missed content, targeted review and to provide specific lessons in iReady as a way to help close the gaps that were still existing.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance is always something we are working on with our families. We have a full time social worker who completes home visits, provides support for her caseload, and will transport/arrange transportation when necessary. She provided families with grant-like opportunities to take care of things such as lice, lack of food, lack of clothing, etc. She does do monthly incentives, but this is an area we can continue to work on.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Continue to build foundational skills
2. Continue to build comprehension skills
3. Continue to focus on writing instruction
4. Building a science foundation from K-4; protecting time for instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: It will be important to continue the focus on writing instruction and more strategic progress monitoring. We will progress monitor the instruction using a monthly assessment. We will hold continued planning sessions, coaching of instruction, individual conferencing, and ensure we are strategically focused on both informative and opinion topics prior to January. This will allow us to prioritize student needs before taking FSA.

Measurable Outcome: Proficiency will increase in each grade level by at least 5% as measured by FSA ELA given in Spring 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will hold continued planning sessions, coaching of instruction, individual conferencing, and ensure we are strategically focused on both informative and opinion topics prior to January.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We have chosen this because this will have the greatest impact on our instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Facilitate Planning Sessions

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

2. Conduct Coaching Cycles with instruction, student need, and data analysis in mind.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

3. Provide professional development with individual conferencing focus

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

4. Provide informal/formal opportunities for assessment gathering and conduct data dives based on these assessments.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will include the 30 minutes designated for explicit phonics instruction through SIPPS. To address reading comprehension skills, we continue to plan for strategic small group instruction during a protected time of 60 minutes designated for small group instruction. We will also incorporate content-specific texts in small group instruction to increase proficiency in reading, writing and science.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the proficiency of our students in each grade level in ELA by at least 5% as measured by FSA given in Spring 2021. We will use monthly assessment to track standards mastery so we can target specific standards and students in small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will ensure our teachers are trained in the use of SIPPS and provide on-going coaching in the area. We will hold grade level standards based planning. We will use monthly assessment to track standards mastery so we can target specific standards and students in small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We chose this strategy due to the new adoption of curriculum. We know that coaching teachers and ensuring fidelity of implementation is present is critical. We have to progress monitor to ensure what we are doing is working so we can make adjustments and target more strategically the skills needed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure training of every teacher in SIPPS with coaching in grades K-2.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

2. Standards Based Planning will be implemented with the assistance of the literacy coaches.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

3. Gather monthly assessments and conduct data reviews of each tracking standards mastery.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Instructional practice specifically related to science instruction because it is our lowest area of proficiency and it is an area where all grade levels are represented in the questions.

Measurable Outcome: Increase proficiency by at least 5% as measured by the SSS given in spring 2021. We will use the 9-week progress monitoring tests to assess student performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will ensure there is standards-based planning as teams occurring. We will use small group instruction as necessary with some technology to target prior grade level standards. We will implement long term investigations across all grade levels. As well, fidelity checks will be critical to ensure science instruction is being done in all grade levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We chose these strategies because we know using standards to drive our instruction is critical. Small group instruction is a way to target difficulties with prior grade level standards that were not taught during elearning. Fidelity checks are a way to ensure accountability of teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards based planning is expected.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

2. Small group instruction

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

3. Fidelity Checks

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our SWD group fell below the federal index in the year of 2018-2019 school year. This area is identified as a critical due to 12% of our students showing proficiency as well as only indicating 36% making gains and 48% of our bottom-quartile students making gains in ELA. In math, the numbers were equally as low.

Measurable Outcome: Our percent of students in these areas will increase by at least 5% on the ELA, Math and Science Assessments given in Spring 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Brainspring implementation with fidelity must occur for our students to achieve. Specific standards based planning collaboratively with the general education teacher. Monitoring the data of our students to ensure we are meeting standards as outlined by the specific grade level as well as skills deficits. Rtl groups will be targeted for reading and math to address multiple levels of skills deficits.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: There is research to support growth of students who use Brainspring with fidelity. We also know it is best practice to plan and progress monitor students as a whole but specifically are engaging all stakeholders this group of students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Brainspring implementation will occur with students

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

2. Standards based planning in collaboration with general education teachers.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

3. Data tracking and strategic grouping

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our African-American group of students fell below the federal index in the year of 2018-2019 school year. This area is identified as a critical due to 22% of our students showing proficiency as well as only indicating 50% making gains in ELA. In math, the numbers were equally as low.
Measurable Outcome:	Our African-American students will increase by at least 5% in both reading and math regarding proficiency and gains when give the Spring 2021 Statewide Assessment. We will progress monitor through monthly assessments in both areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitor this particular subgroup of students in all academic areas. Ensuring our teachers are aware of students who are not performing often will allow us to target with more intentionality rather than loosely identify the needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We know progress monitoring is a critical way to see if strategies implemented are resulting in increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify African American students in each grade level not performing

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

2. Hold some focus groups to identify needs and discuss a plan of action.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

3. Progress monitor more closely this subgroup of students.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Our school sends out a monthly/weekly newsletter to inform stakeholders of upcoming events and critical information related to instruction. We have three family events to celebrate multiculturalism, holiday spirit, and a science night. Next year, provided CDC guidelines allow us to do so, we will continue to hold these events for our families. We have multiple business partners who have donated school supplies, backpacks, certificates, coupons for student achievement, and gift cards to purchase items for our students and staff. We partner with other agencies to obtain items for monthly behavior celebrations. Our student services team also provides resources to families for basic needs such as food, clothing, in addition to offering and connecting families with outside counseling services. Often times are families are afforded opportunities for tutoring services through these agencies, but we also partner with a local high school for volunteers and tutors for our students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00